

CONFIDENTIAL

. . . . The 14th meeting of the CIA RETIREMENT BOARD convened at 2:05 p.m. on Thursday, 8 July 1965, with the following present:

Mr. Emmett D. Echols, Chairman

25X1A9a

Mr. Paul A. Borel, DDI Member

25X1A9a

The minutes of the 13th meeting were reviewed and approved as presented

MR. ECHOLS: We have four groups of cases today. In the first group we have one employee who is already of mandatory retirement age.

Her Career Service has requested that prior to her designation an extension of service be granted to permit her to complete her tour overseas and return. The extension requested is to March, 1966. She is a Communications Career Service employee.

25X1A9a

extend her?

MR. ECHOLS: Oh yes, indeed. I would certainly think so.

Certainly the orderly handling of affairs of the Agency should take precedence, I think, over the technicalities of the statute.

Do you consider that a suitable thing to do? -

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS: Any comments or discussion desired on this case?

or may I have a motion?

I

I move it be approved.

MR. BOREL: Second.

... This motion was then passed ...

MR. ECHOLS: Group B consists of 14 employees who clearly

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP78-03092A000100 150002-02 and

SECRET

Agency service they will immediately acquire a vested interest if they choose to do so.

25X1A9a

In the absence of any discussion, Mr. Chairman,

I move that we designate them and offer them the opportunity to elect to remain in the

System.

MR. BOREL: Second.

. . . This motion was then passed

MR. ECHOLS: Group C consists of two employees who are on the verge of completing 15 years of service -- and by verge I mean they are within six months. Therefore, I think at this time, since the Regulation calls for a 15 year review six months prior to attainment of the 15th year, designation at this time ought to simultaneously be viewed as the 15th year review -- leaving only at the appropriate time our asking the individual whether he elects to remain in the System.

25X1A9a

Any discussion on these two cases?

I move their approval.

25X1A9a

Second.

.... This motion was then passed

MR. ECHOLS: In the last group we have five employees who appear to clearly meet the basic criteria but have less than 15 years' service. Their cases will be reviewed again after the appropriate interval.

25X1A9a I move we designate them.

... This motion was then seconded and passed

MR. ECHOLS: I would like to discuss one little point with you -- and maybe some of you have some business.

I think we have gotten ourselves in a procedural bind -- as we

SECRET

discovered last time -- when a Career Service redlined somebody and we notified them and they file an appeal. I was fiddling with a draft of this Notification of Non-eligibility, which I didn't have time to complete but which would go something along this line:

cIA Retirement and Disability System, prescribes that the Director of Personnel shall notify an employee in writing whenever he makes a determination pursuant to that Regulation which affects the rights or benefits under the System of such employee. It is for this reason that I am informing you that based upon information available to me I have determined that you do not meet the criteria described in for designation as a participant in the CIA Retirement and Disability System at this time. This in no way alters your current status under the Civil Service Retirement System, and if you agree with my determination there is nothing you need do.

above decision was made in your case are incomplete or in error, or you may wish to better understand the basis of the

determination. If so, I suggest you read paragraph e of

It is always possible that the records upon which the

which sets forth the specific requirements that an employee must meet in order to qualify for designation as a participant in the System, and paragraph 5 of Employee

Bulletin dated _______, entitled: Public Law 88-643

"The Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for

Certain Employees," which further explains the meaning of

"qualifying service." If after studying these materials you have further questions, or if you would like to have your

case formally reviewed by the CIA Retirement Board, please

come see us.

25X1A

25X1A



Then we will take a look at the case and if we think the individual has a problem or a reasonable question -- or even if he doesn't -- then we get him in touch with his Career Board -- then have the case come aformally to the Board and we can give him a determination that has been fully staffed out by the Board, if you Then we advise him of his right to appeal. Then it goes to the IG -- and will. then the IG would come to us and say: Well, what is the story? We have the Career Service position, we have the Board recommendation, and any additional material that I or the Staff here might dig up, and we say: Here is the case. I think the IG could very quickly reach his decision.

Does this sound more logical than having a lot of appeals going up that haven't really been staffed out--

ILLEGIB 25X1A9a Or are really irrelevant -- some of them -- too. MR. ECHOLS: As I say here, if the individual agrees with my determination, I think we can forget about it. 25X1A9a Does this supercede that earlier letter now? MR. ECHOLS: Yes. 25X1A9a Which was very curt. MR. ECHOLS: Oh yes, this is very different. Well, I will try to have this ready for you at the next meeting.

Mike, did you have a question? 25X1A9a

> In your second sentence did you say "the records submitted to me" or "available to me"?

MR. ECHOLS: (Reading) 'It is for this reason that I am

informing you that based upon information available to me...."

25X1A9a Wouldn't you protect yourself if you said

MR. ECHOLS: Well, not necessarily, because I have access to the official file.

What if you don't get 25X1A9a

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CM 78 03092A000100150002 0

"information submitted to me"?

Approved For Release 2001/07/12: CIA-RDP78-03092A000100150002-0

SEPHET COMPANIAN.

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS:

Then it isn't available to me.

25X1A9a

MR. ECHOLS:

Oh, it's available to you, if you get to it.

It really doesn't make any difference to me--

I was just thinking it would just be more

protection for yourself if you said "submitted to me." Now maybe someone forgot to add on those two TDY trips that the girl took, that you forgot to work on, that maybe the information is available to you if you would look further in the file.

Actually, when you get downto it, Emmett, you're not going to have much information submitted to you, other than the redlined list -- that is going to be the basis for that first letter.

MR. BOREL: You are speaking with your corporate hat on, though, aren't you? --'based upon the Office of Personnel review, I have made this determination."

MR. ECHOLS: Well, I think with the invitation to come in, we will catch them all if they have any gripes.

One of my own Career Service people has complained that she feels she is being slighted because we redlined her. I looked at her file, and she has about eight or nine years of overseas service, and is approaching retirement age. I don't know why we redlined her, but I think probably we made a mistake, so I'm going to submit her case to the Board. That will happen. After all, this is based on these machineruns--

25X1A9a

We found several errors.

MR. BOREL: I wonder if we will ever have a case where someone is even admitted or invited to join that isn't eligible. (Laughing)

MR. ECHOLS:

We hope not!

25X1A9a

Where you have a redline situation and it's strictly an administrative error on perhaps the part of the Career Service in examining the list in the first place, would this constitute, really, an appeal, or could the Career Service institute an immediate nomination without regard to the employee's coming through these other channels for a hearing?



MR. ECHOLS: We would immediately go back to the Career Service and say, "Look, we think you made a mistake here" -- and if they agree they will initiate a nomination, and that will be that.

25X1A9a I was thinking of the case you pointed out, where apparently there was something lacking, and that that was an administrative oversight.

MR. ECHOLS: Well, this was an administrative oversight, apparently. I suspect my Career Service redlined this person because they thought it was unlikely she would go overseas again, and they thought she was not currently required to go overseas. I think it was an erroneous interpretation of our regulations -- I think it was bad judgment on their part, or a misinterpretation. Well, anyhow, we will see what the Board thinks of the case when it comes up.

Any other new business? (No response.)

. . . The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

CONFIDENTIAL